arXiv:1606.02401v2 [stat.ML] 28 Jun 2016

On estimating a mixture on graphons

Soumendu Sundar Mukherjee*, Purnamrita Sarkar†, and Lizhen Lin‡

Abstract

Community detection, which focuses on clustering nodes or detecting communities in (mostly) a single network, is a problem of considerable practical interest and has received a great deal of attention in the research community. While being able to cluster within a network is important, there are emerging needs to be able to *cluster multiple networks*. This is largely motivated by the routine collection of network data that are generated from potentially different populations, such as brain networks of subjects from different disease groups, genders, or biological networks generated under different experimental conditions, etc. We propose a simple and general framework for clustering multiple networks based on a mixture model on graphons. Our clustering method employs graphon estimation as a first step and performs spectral clustering on the matrix of distances between estimated graphons. This is illustrated through both simulated and real data sets, and theoretical justification of the algorithm is given in terms of consistency.

1 Introduction

Over the last few decades data represented in various non-conventional forms have become increasingly more prevalent. Typical examples include data that are in the forms of matrices, subspaces, shapes, curves etc. A network, which is used to model interactions or communications among a set of agents or nodes, is arguably among one of the most common and important representations for modern complex data. Networks are ubiquitous in many scientific fields, ranging from computer networks, brain networks and biological networks, to social networks, co-authorship networks and many more. Over the past few decades, great advancement has been made in developing methodologies and computational tools for inference on network data. In particular, various random graph or network models have been proposed, including the relatively simple Erdös-Rényi model [9], stochastic blockmodel and their extensions [12, 13, 3], latent space model [17], and the more recent developments based on graphons [19, 10]. Based on the models, one can make inference such as estimating

*Department of Statistics, University of California at Berkeley, CA 94720-3860. E-mail address: soumendu@berkeley.edu

†Department of Statistics and Data Sciences, University of Texas at Austin, TX 78712. E-mail address: purna.sarkar@austin.utexas.edu

‡Department of Statistics and Data Sciences, University of Texas at Austin, TX 78712. E-mail address: lizhen.lin@austin.utexas.edu

the link probabilities between nodes, performing link prediction, or clustering the nodes and so on. Clustering (the nodes), often called community detection, has attracted a great deal of recent attention from the research community due to its practical relevance. Various community detection algorithms or methods have been proposed, including modularity based methods [15], spectral methods [18], likelihood based methods [5, 8, 4, 1], and optimization based approaches like semidefinite programming methods [2], etc.

The majority of the work in the community detection literature including the above mentioned focus on finding communities among the nodes in *a single network*. While this is still a very important problem with many open questions, there is an emerging need to be able to detect *clusters among multiple network valued objects*, where a network itself is a fundamental unit of data. This is largely motivated by the routine collection of populations or subpopulations of network valued data objects. Technological advancement and the explosion of complex data in many domains has made this a somewhat common practice.

For example, in neuroscience, brain networks of multiple subjects which measure connectivity among different brain areas or regions are often available with the subjects potentially coming from different gender, age group, or diseases status etc. Being able to cluster the subjects (or their corresponding networks) would provide tremendously useful information or insights into understanding the underlying mechanism of brain diseases or disorders.

Our work proposes a simple and general framework for clustering multiple networks - viewing the data as coming from a mixture model on graphons. This is achieved by first obtaining a graphon estimate of each of the networks, constructing a distance matrix based on the graphon estimates, and then performing spectral clustering on the resulting distance matrix. Our method is backed by solid theory in terms of consistency and is illustrated via both simulated and real data examples. The simulation results show that our algorithms clearly outperforms the naive method of clustering (vectorized) adjacency matrices. We are also able to detect cluster structure in the 1000 Functional Connectomes Project (1000 FCP) dataset [1].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we briefly describe graphon-estimation methods and other related work. Next, in Section 3 we formally describe our setup and introduce our algorithm. Section 4 focuses the analysis of this algorithm and derive the main theoretical results. Finally, in Section 5 we provide simulated and real data examples.

2 Related work

One of the key steps in our framework is to obtain a good initial graphon estimate (which is loosely used to mean an estimate of the link probability matrix) for each of the networks. There has been a number of works in the literature addressing this problem. We cite two such methods of obtaining graphon estimates, which we will use in our algorithm.

A prominent estimator of graphons is the so called USVT (Universal Singular Value Thresholding) estimator proposed by [6]. USVT can be viewed as general procedure for estimating the entries of a large structured matrix, given a noisy realization of the matrix. This includes estimating link probability matrices which is our case of interest, low rank matrices, distance matrices and so on. The main idea behind USVT is to threshold (at an

[1] http://fcon_1000.projects.nitrc.org

universal cutoff) the singular values of the observed matrix and construct an estimate using the thresholded singular values and singular vectors. In applying USVT to estimating link probability matrices in particular, the major steps can be summarized in the following:

1. Let $A = \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i u_i u_i^T$ be the singular value decomposition of the adjacent matrix A.
2. Let $S = \{i : s_i \geq (2+\eta)\sqrt{n}\}$, where $\eta \in (0,1)$ is some small positive number. Let $\widehat{A} = \sum_{i \in S} s_i u_i u_i^T$.
3. Let $\widehat{P} = (\widehat{P}_{ij})$, where

$$\widehat{P}_{ij} := \begin{cases} \widehat{A}_{ij}, & \text{if } 0 \leq \widehat{A}_{ij} \leq 1 \\ 1, & \text{if } \widehat{A}_{ij} \geq 1 \\ 0, & \text{if } \widehat{A}_{ij} \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

$\widehat{P}$ serves as the estimate of the link probability matrix P. Consistency of $\hat{P}$ was established in [6] under general structural assumptions on the true P.

A recent work by [21] proposes a novel and computationally efficient approach for estimating the link probability matrix by neighborhood smoothing. In more details, given an adjacent matrix A, the link probability P_{ij} between node i and j is estimated by

$$\hat{P}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_i} A_{i'j}}{|\mathcal{N}_i|} + \frac{\sum_{j' \in \mathcal{N}_j} A_{ij'}}{|\mathcal{N}_j|}\right),$$

where $\mathcal{N}_i$ is a certain set of neighboring nodes of node i (which consists of the nodes that have similar connections as node i). Efficient neighborhood selection procedures are presented and the resulting estimator of the link probability matrix is shown to be consistent.

There are several other methods for graphon estimation, e.g., by fitting a stochastic blockmodel [16]. These methods can also be used in our algorithm.

A recent work [7] proposes a graph-based method for change-point detection. Their setup consists of an independent sequence of observations $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,n}$, which is phrased in the context of hypothesis testing:

$$H_0 : \mathbf{y}_i \sim F_0 \qquad i = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{1}$$

$$H_a : \exists 1 \leq \tau \leq n,\ \mathbf{y}_i \sim \begin{cases} F_1, & i > \tau \\ F_0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

The observations $\mathbf{y}_i$ can be very general including high-dimensional vectors or even networks, with the latter bearing some resemblance with our framework. The authors started with constructing an n by n graph G based on the observations $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,n}$ where the $\mathbf{y}_i$'s are nodes, and the edges represent similarity or proximity between these nodes in terms of some distance measure. Their test statistic is based on counting the number of edges in the graph G that connect observations from the "past" ($\leq t$) to the "future" ($> t$), for each potential candidate t for the change point τ. The authors applied their procedure on the MIT media lab cell phone network data, by taking $\mathbf{y}_i$ to be the adjacency matrix of the cell phone network

at time t, and were able to detect a change point. This is similar to our framework — the authors of [7] are essentially clustering the networks into "past" and "future". We remark here that our clustering method suggests an alternative method for change point detection, namely by looking at the second eigenvector of the distance matrix between estimated graphons. We are pursuing this direction in another work.

Another related work is due to [11] which aims to extend the classical large sample theory to model network-valued objects. The authors consider the space of networks represented as graph Laplacians and study the geometry of this space of Laplacians based on which appropriate notions of 'mean networks' and dispersions are defined. Statistical inference is based on the asymptotic distribution of their sample counterparts. They show that the space of graph Laplacians is a submanifold of an Euclidean space, thus Euclidean distance is a natural metric to use for defining the mean networks. They study two- and multiple-sample tests based on χ^2 statistics constructed from sample mean networks. They performed various hypothesis tests on the 1000 FCP dataset.

3 A framework for clustering networks

Let G be a binary random network or graph with n nodes. Denote by A its adjacency matrix, which is an n by n symmetric matrix with binary entries. That is, $A_{ij} = A_{ji} \in \{0, 1\}, 1 \leq i < j \leq n$, where $A_{ij} = 1$ if there is an observed edge between nodes i and j, and $A_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. All the diagonal elements of A are structured to be zero (i.e., $A_{ii} = 0$). We assume the following random Bernoulli model with:

$$A_{ij} \mid P_{ij} \sim \texttt{Bernoulli}(P_{ij}),\ i < j, \tag{3}$$

where $P_{ij} = P(A_{ij} = 1)$ is the link probability between nodes i and j. We denote the link probability matrix as $P = ((P_{ij}))$. The edge probabilities are often modeled using the so-called *graphons*. A graphon $f(x, y)$ is a nonnegative bounded, measurable symmetric function $f(x, y)$ defined on $(0, 1) \times (0, 1)$, such that

$$P_{ij} = f(\xi_i, \xi_j), \tag{4}$$

where ξ_i, ξ_j are *i.i.d. uniform random variables* on $(0, 1)$. Any exchangeable network arises in this way (by Aldous-Hoover representation).

Intuitively speaking, one wishes to model a discrete network G using some continuous object f. Our current work focuses on the problem of *clustering networks*. Unlike in a traditional setup, where one observes a single network (with potentially growing number of nodes) and the goal is often to cluster the nodes, here we observe multiple networks and are interested in clustering these networks viewed as fundamental data units.

A simple and natural model for this is what we call the *graphon mixture model* for obvious reasons: there are only K (fixed) underlying graphons $f_1, \ldots, f_K$ giving rise to link probability matrices $\Pi_1, \ldots, \Pi_K$ and we observe T networks sampled i.i.d. from the mixture model

$$\mathbb{P}_{mix}(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{K} q_i \mathbb{P}_{\Pi_i}(A), \tag{5}$$

where the q_i's are the mixing proportions and $\mathbb{P}_P(A) = \prod_{u<v} P_{uv}^{A_{uv}}(1-P_{uv})^{1-A_{uv}}$ is the probability of observing the adjacency matrix A when the link probability matrix is given by P.

Suppose we observe T independent networks and let $A_1, \ldots, A_T$ be the corresponding adjacency matrices. We propose the following simple and general algorithm for clustering them:

Algorithm 1 Clustering multiple networks

1: **Graphon estimation.** Given $A_1, \ldots, A_T$, estimate their corresponding link probability matrices $P_1, \ldots, P_T$ using any one of the "blackbox" algorithms such as USVT ([6]), the neighborhood smoothing approach by [21] etc. Call these estimates $\hat{P}_1, \ldots, \hat{P}_T$.

2: **Forming a distance matrix.** Compute the T by T distance matrix $\hat{D}$ with $\hat{D}_{ij} = \|\hat{P}_i - \hat{P}_j\|_F$, where $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm. $\hat{D}$ is considered an estimate of $D = ((D_{ij}))$ where $D_{ij} = \|P_i - P_j\|_F$.

3: **Clustering.** Apply the spectral clustering algorithm to the distance matrix $\hat{D}$.

We will from now on denote the above algorithm with the different graphon estimation ("blackbox") approaches as follows: the algorithm with the USVT method as a blackbox will be denoted by `CL-USVT`; with the neighborhood smoothing method will be denoted by `CL-NBS`. We will compare these two algorithms with the `CL-NAIVE` method which does not estimate the underlying graphon, but uses the vectorized binary string representation of the adjacency matrices, and clusters those (in the spirit of [7]).

4 Consistency

In this section we establish consistency of Algorithm 1 under various graphon estimation procedures. We start with the following proposition which shows that if the graphon estimation procedure has good consistency properties, that can lead to consistency of the distance matrix formed in step 2 of Algorithm 1.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume for some absolute constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ the following holds for each $i = 1, \ldots, T$:*

$$\mathbb{E}\frac{\|\hat{P}_i - P_i\|_F^2}{n^2} \leq C_i n^{-\alpha}(\log n)^{\beta}, \tag{6}$$

where the constants C_i presumably depending on the graphon f_i. Then one has

$$\mathbb{E}\frac{\|\hat{D} - D\|_F^2}{n^2 T^2} \leq 4C_T n^{-\alpha}(\log n)^{\beta}, \tag{7}$$

where $C_T = \max_{i \leq i \leq T} C_i$.

Alternatively, if for some $\epsilon_{n,T} \in (0,1)$, one has, with probability at least $1 - \epsilon_{n,T}$, that for each $i = 1, \ldots, T$

$$\frac{\|\hat{P}_i - P_i\|_F^2}{n^2} \leq C_i n^{-\alpha}(\log n)^{\beta}, \tag{8}$$

then with probability at least $1 - \epsilon_{n,T}$ *one has*

$$\frac{\|\hat{D} - D\|_F^2}{n^2 T^2} \leq 4C_T n^{-\alpha} (\log n)^{\beta}. \tag{9}$$

Proof. The proof is straightforward. By triangle inequality we have

$$|\hat{D}_{ij} - D_{ij}| = \left| \|\hat{P}_i - \hat{P}_j\|_F - \|P_i - P_j\|_F \right| \leq \|\hat{P}_i - P_i\|_F + \|\hat{P}_j - P_j\|_F.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{D} - D\|_F^2 = \sum_{i,j} |\hat{D}_{ij} - D_{ij}|^2 &\leq \sum_{i,j} (\|\hat{P}_i - P_i\|_F + \|\hat{P}_j - P_j\|_F)^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i,j} (\|\hat{P}_i - P_i\|_F^2 + \|\hat{P}_j - P_j\|_F^2) = 4T \sum_i \|\hat{P}_i - P_i\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently we get (7) and (9). □

USVT: Theorem 2.7 of [6] tells us that if the underlying graphons are Lipschitz then

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{\|\hat{P}_i - P_i\|_F^2}{n^2} \leq C_i n^{-1/3},$$

where the constant C_i depends only on the Lipschitz constant of the underlying graphon f_i. So, (6) is satisfied with $\alpha = 1/3$, $\beta = 0$.

Neighborhood smoothing: The authors of [21] work with a class $\mathcal{F}_{\delta,L}$ of piecewise Lipschitz graphons, see Definition 2.1 of their paper. The proof of Theorem 2.2 of [21] reveals that if $f_i \in \mathcal{F}_{\delta_i,L_i}$, then there exist a global constant C and constants $C_i \equiv C_i(L_i)$, such that for all $n \geq N_i \equiv N_i(\delta_i)$, with probability at least $1 - n^{-C}$, we have

$$\frac{\|\hat{P}_i - P_i\|_F^2}{n^2} \leq C_i \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}.$$

Therefore, with probability at least $(1 - n^{-C})^T \geq 1 - Tn^{-C}$, we have for all $i = 1, \ldots, T$ that

$$\frac{\|\hat{P}_i - P_i\|_F^2}{n^2} \leq C_i \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}},$$

for all $n \geq N_T := \max_{1 \leq i \leq T} N_i$. Thus the condition (8) of Proposition 4.1 is satisfied with $\alpha = \beta = 1/2$, and $\epsilon_{n,T} = Tn^{-C}$.

Remark 4.1. *In the case of the graphon mixture model (5), the constants* C_T *and* N_T *will be free of* T *as there are only* K *(fixed) underlying graphons. Also, if each* $f_i \in \mathcal{F}_{\delta,L_i}$*, then* N_T *will not depend on* T *and if the Lipschitz constants are the same for each graphon, then* C_T *will not depend on* T*.*

Remark 4.2. *There are combinatorial algorithms that can achieve the minimax rate,* $n^{-1} \log n$*, of graphon estimation [10]. Albeit impractical, these algorithms can be used to achieve the optimal bound of* $4C_T n^{-1} \log n$ *in Proposition 4.1.*

Remark 4.3. *We do not expect* `CL-NAIVE` *to perform well simply because A is not a good estimate of P in Frobenius norm in general. Indeed,*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n^2}\mathbb{E}\|A-P\|_F^2 &= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i,j}\mathbb{E}(A_{ij}-P_{ij})^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i\neq j}P_{ij}(1-P_{ij}) + \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_i P_{ii}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4}(1+o(1)),\end{aligned}$$

with equality, for example, when each $P_{ij}=\frac{1}{2}$.

Proposition 4.2 (Davis-Kahan)**.** *Suppose D has rank K. Let V (resp. $\hat{V}$) be the $T\times K$ matrix whose columns correspond to the leading K eigenvectors (corresponding to the K largest-in-magnitude eigenvalues) of D (resp. $\hat{D}$). Let $\gamma=\gamma(K,n,T)$ be the K-th smallest eigenvalue value of D in magnitude. Then there exists an orthogonal matrix $\hat{O}$ such that*

$$\|\hat{V}\hat{O}-V\|_F \leq \frac{4\|\hat{D}-D\|_F}{\gamma}.$$

Proof. This follows from a slight variant of Davis-Kahan theorem that appears in [20]. Since D is a Euclidean distance matrix of rank K, its eigenvalues must be of the form

$$\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_u > 0 = \cdots = 0 > \lambda_v \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n,$$

with $u+n-v+1=K$. Applying Theorem 2 of [20] with $r=1$, $s=u$ we get that if V_+ denotes matrix whose columns are the eigenvectors of D corresponding to $\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_u$ and $\hat{V}_+$ denotes the corresponding matrix for $\hat{D}$, then there exists an orthogonal matrix $\hat{O}_+$ such that

$$\|\hat{V}_+\hat{O}_+ - V_+\|_F \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}\|\hat{D}-D\|_F}{\lambda_u}.$$

Similarly, considering the eigenvalues $\lambda_v,\ldots,\lambda_n$, and applying Theorem 2 of [20] with $r=v$ and $s=n$ we get that

$$\|\hat{V}_-\hat{O}_- - V_-\|_F \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}\|\hat{D}-D\|_F}{-\lambda_v},$$

where V_-, $\hat{V}_-$ and $\hat{O}_-$ are the relevant matrices. Set $V=[V_+ : V_-]$, $\hat{V}=[\hat{V}_+ : \hat{V}_-]$ and $\hat{O}=\begin{pmatrix}\hat{O}_+ & 0\\ 0 & \hat{O}_-\end{pmatrix}$. Then note that the columns of V are eigenvectors of D corresponding to its K largest-in-magnitude eigenvalues, that O is orthogonal and also that $\gamma=\min\{\lambda_u,-\lambda_v\}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{V}\hat{O}-V\|_F^2 &= \|\hat{V}_+\hat{O}_+ - V_+\|_F^2 + \|\hat{V}_-\hat{O}_- - V_-\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \frac{8\|\hat{D}-D\|_F^2}{\lambda_u^2} + \frac{8\|\hat{D}-D\|_F^2}{\lambda_v^2} \\ &\leq \frac{16\|\hat{D}-D\|_F^2}{\gamma^2}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose there are K underlying graphons, as in the graphon mixture model (5), and assume that in our sample there is at least one representative from each of these. Then D has the form $Z\mathcal{D}Z^T$ where the ith row of the binary matrix Z has a single one at position l if network A_i is sampled from Π_l, and $\mathcal{D}$ is the $K \times K$ matrix of distances between the Π_l. As a consequence D is of rank K. Then there exists a $T \times K$ matrix V whose columns are eigenvectors of D corresponding to the K nonzero eigenvalues, such that*

$$V_{i\star} = V_{j\star} \Leftrightarrow Z_{i\star} = Z_{j\star},$$

so that knowing V, one can recover the clusters perfectly.

Proof. The proof is standard. Note that Z^TZ is positive definite. Consider the matrix $(Z^TZ)^{1/2}B(Z^TZ)^{1/2}$ and let $U\Delta U^T$ be its spectral decomposition. Then the matrix $V = Z(Z^TZ)^{-1/2}U$ has the required properties. □

In the light of propositions 4.1-4.2, we have, either in expectation or with high probability, that

$$\|\hat{V}\hat{O} - V\|_F \leq \frac{16C_T T n^{1-\alpha/2}(\log n)^{\beta/2}}{\gamma}. \tag{10}$$

As mentioned in Remark 4.1, since there are K (fixed) underlying graphons, the constant C_T does not depend on T. The bound (10) can now be turned into a bound on the proportion of "misclustered" networks, defined appropriately. There are several ways to define "misclustered" nodes in the context of community detection in stochastic blockmodels that are easy to analyze with spectral clustering (see e.g. [18, 14]). These definitions work in our context too. For example, if we use Definition 4 of [18] and denote by $\mathcal{M}$ the set of misclustered networks, then by their proof of Theorem 1, we have

$$|\mathcal{M}| \leq 8m_T\|\hat{V}\hat{O} - V\|_F^2,$$

where $m_T = \max_{j=1,\dots,K}(Z^TZ)_{jj}$ is the maximum number of networks coming from any of the graphons.

In general, it is hard to obtain a bound on γ. However, we show that this depends on the separation between the graphons in simple cases. We will consider a mixture of two graphons with equal mixture components. Let the distance between the population graphons be dn We have $D = Z\mathcal{D}Z^T$, where the 2×2 population matrix be $\mathcal{D}$ has $\mathcal{D}(i,j) = \mathcal{D}(j,i) = dn$. Here $Z\mathcal{D}Z^T = dn(E_T - ZZ^T)$, where E_T is the $T \times T$ matrix of all ones. The eigenvalues of this matrix are $-Tnd/2$ and $-Tnd/2$. Thus in this case $\gamma = Tnd/2$. As a result (10) becomes

$$\|\hat{V}\hat{O} - V\|_F \leq \frac{32C_T n^{-\alpha/2}(\log n)^{\beta/2}}{d}. \tag{11}$$

Let us look at a more specific case of blockmodels with equal number of clusters of equal size to understand the role of d. Let C be a $n \times k$ binary matrix of memberships such that $C_{ib} = 1$ if node i within a blockmodel comes from cluster b.

Corollary 4.1. *Consider T networks such that half of them are generated from Blockmodel 1 with $\Pi_1 = CB_1C^T$ with $B_1 = (p-q)I_k + qE_k$ and the rest are generated from Blockmodel 2*

with $\Pi_2 = CB_2C^T$ with $B_2 = (p'-q')I_k + q'E_k$, where I_k is the identity matrix of order k. Then there exists an orthogonal matrix $\hat{O}$ such that

$$\|\hat{V}\hat{O} - V\|_F \leq \frac{32C_T n^{-\alpha/2}(\log n)^{\beta/2}}{\min\{|p-p'|/\sqrt{k}, |q-q'|\sqrt{1-1/k}\}}. \tag{12}$$

Moreover, in order to distinguish between these two blockmodels with identical cluster memberships by our method, we necessarily have to have

$$\min\{|p-p'|/\sqrt{k}, |q-q'|\sqrt{1-1/k}\} = \Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}\right). \tag{13}$$

Proof. In this case $d = \|\Pi_1 - \Pi_2\|_F/n = \sqrt{(p-p')^2/k + (q-q')^2(1-1/k))}$. The bound (12) now follows from (11). If $\min\{(p-p')/k, (q-q')\sqrt{1-1/k}\} = \Omega(n^{-\alpha/2}(\log n)^{\beta/2})$, then Proposition 4.3 shows that our simple algorithm will be able to successfully cluster the networks generated from these blockmodels. As the minimax rate of graphon estimation is $n^{-1}\log n$, we get (13) by setting $\alpha = \beta = 1$. □

5 Simulation study and data analysis


We provide our results in two parts. First we use simulations to compare the performance of our method with different algorithms for estimating the graphons. Next, we apply our algorithm on the 1000 FCP dataset to cluster "binarized" MRI images.

5.1 Simulation experiments

We provide two simulated data experiments. In each experiment twenty 150 -node networks were generated from a mixture of two graphons, 13 networks from the first and the other 7 from the second. We also used a scalar multiplier with the graphons to ensure that the networks are not too dense. The average degree for all these experiments were around 20-25. We report the average error bars from a few random runs.

First we generate a mixture of graphons from two blockmodels, with probability matrices $(p_i - q_i)I_k + q_iE_k$ with $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We use $p_2 = p_1(1+\epsilon)$ and $q_2 = q_1(1+\epsilon)$ and measure clustering accuracy as the multiplicative error ϵ is increased from .05 to .15. We compare `CL-USVT`, `CL-NBS` and `CL-NAIVE` in Figure 1(A). We notehave observed two things. First, `CL-USVT` and `CL-NBS` start distinguishing the graphons better as ϵ increases (as the theory suggests). Second, the naive approach does not do a good job even when ϵ increases.

In the second simulation, we generate the networks from two smooth graphons Π_1 and Π_2, where $\Pi_2 = \Pi_1(1+\epsilon)$ (here Π_1 corresponds to the graphon 3 appearing in Table 1 of [21]). As is seen from Figure 1(B), here also `CL-USVT` and `CL-NBS` outperform the naive algorithm by a huge margin. Also, `CL-NBS` is consistently better than `CL-USVT`. This may have happened because we did our experiments on sparse networks, where USVT struggles to find the non-noisy eigenvalues.



(A) (B)

Figure 1: We show the behavior of the three algorithms when ϵ increases, when the underlying network is generated from (A) a blockmodel and (B) a smooth graphon.

5.2 1000 FCP data

In this dataset there are 1049 correlation matrices of brain regions corresponding to 1049 individuals, whose brain scan was done at one of 21 centers. There are potential gender and age differences in these scans and also differences ascribable to the various scanning centers. We threshold the each of correlation matrices at 80th percentile of the entries to form binary networks. We applied our clustering method on various subsets on this set of networks. For example, in one experiment we grouped the data according to the scanning centers and then in each center considered only those individuals whose gender identities were known and ran our clustering methods on their brain networks. Table 1 presents the performance of our methods for one of the centers ("Leiden_2200"). We find that `CL-USVT`, and `CL-NBS` outperform `CL-NAIVE`.

Method	MCR	NMI
`CL-USVT`	0.3158	0.1961
`CL-NBS`	0.3684	0.1072
`CL-NAIVE`	0.4211	0.0136

Table 1: Spectral clustering with $K = 2$ on the 1000 FCP networks corresponding to the center "Leiden_2200" where the gender identities were known, the resulting clusters are compared (using misclassification rate (MCR) and normalized mutual information (NMI)) against the true gender identities. Percentage of males in this center was 0.57.

Acknowledgments

We sincerely thank Dr. Cedric Ginestet and Professor Eric Kolaczyk for helping us access the data set from the 1000 Functional Connectomes Project that was used in this paper. We also thank Professor Peter J. Bickel for helpful discussions. The first author was partially

supported by National Science Foundation Focused Research Group on Networks grant DMS-1160319 and Loéve Fellowship, University of California, Berkeley.

References

[1] Arash A Amini, Aiyou Chen, Peter J Bickel, Elizaveta Levina, et al. Pseudo-likelihood methods for community detection in large sparse networks. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(4):2097–2122, 2013.

[2] Arash A Amini and Elizaveta Levina. On semidefinite relaxations for the block model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5647*, 2014.

[3] Brian Ball, Brian Karrer, and MEJ Newman. Efficient and principled method for detecting communities in networks. *Physical Review E*, 84(3):036103, 2011.

[4] Peter Bickel, David Choi, Xiangyu Chang, Hai Zhang, et al. Asymptotic normality of maximum likelihood and its variational approximation for stochastic blockmodels. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(4):1922–1943, 2013.

[5] Peter J. Bickel and Aiyou Chen. A nonparametric view of network models and newman girvan and other modularities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the Unites States of America*, 106(50):21068–21073, 2009.

[6] Sourav Chatterjee. Matrix estimation by universal singular value thresholding. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(1):177–214, 02 2015.

[7] Hao Chen and Nancy Zhang. Graph-based change-point detection. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(1):139–176, 02 2015.

[8] David S Choi, Patrick J Wolfe, and Edoardo M Airoldi. Stochastic blockmodels with a growing number of classes. *Biometrika*, page asr053, 2012.

[9] Paul Erdős and Alfréd Rényi. On random graphs i. *Publicationes Mathematicae (Debrecen)*, 6:290–297, 1959 1959.

[10] Chao Gao, Yu Lu, and Harrison H. Zhou. Rate-optimal graphon estimation. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(6):2624–2652, 12 2015.

[11] C. E. Ginestet, P. Balanchandran, S. Rosenberg, and E. D. Kolaczyk. Hypothesis Testing For Network Data in Functional Neuroimaging. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2014.

[12] Paul W Holland, Kathryn Blackmond Laskey, and Samuel Leinhardt. Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social networks*, 5(2):109–137, 1983.

[13] Brian Karrer and M. E. J. Newman. Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 83:016107, Jan 2011.

[14] Jing Lei, Alessandro Rinaldo, et al. Consistency of spectral clustering in stochastic block models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(1):215–237, 2015.

[15] M. E. J. Newman. Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(23):8577–8582, 2006.

[16] Sofia C. Olhede and Patrick J. Wolfe. Network histograms and universality of blockmodel approximation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the Unites States of America*, 111(41):14722–14727, 2014.

[17] A. E. Raftery, M. S. Handcock, and P. D. Hoff. Latent space approaches to social network analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 15:460, 2002.

[18] Karl Rohe, Sourav Chatterjee, and Bin Yu. Spectral clustering and the high-dimensional stochastic block model. *Annals of Statistics*, 39:1878–1915, 2011.

[19] P. J. Wolfe and S. C. Olhede. Nonparametric graphon estimation. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2013.

[20] Y Yu, T Wang, and RJ Samworth. A useful variant of the davis–kahan theorem for statisticians. *Biometrika*, 102(2):315–323, 2015.

[21] Y. Zhang, E. Levina, and J. Zhu. Estimating network edge probabilities by neighborhood smoothing. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2015.